



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,973	12/05/2001	Paul R. Nash	112076-138354	8414
25943 7590 09/10/2010 Schwabe Williamson & Wyatt PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900 1211 SW FIFTH AVENUE PORTLAND, OR 97204				
EXAMINER PHILLIPS, HASSAN A				
ART UNIT 2451		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 09/10/2010		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/010,973

**Applicant(s)**

NASH ET AL.

**Examiner**

HASSAN PHILLIPS

**Art Unit**

2451

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 July 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-8,10-20 and 22-67 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,4-8,10-20 and 22-67 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-06)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to communications filed July 7, 2010. Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-20, and 22-67 remain pending and under consideration.

#### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claim 2 is objected to because of the following informalities: the claim language is unclear. The examiner suggests amending the claim to recite, "The method of claim 1, wherein said valid locator comprises a valid uniform resource locator (URL)", to clarify the claim language. Appropriate correction is required. In order to advance prosecution, the examiner is interpreting the claim as best understood.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

3. In response to the amendments made to claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-18, 35-49, and 67 to direct the claims to statutory subject matter, the examiner has withdrawn the rejection to claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-18, 35-49, and 67 under 35 U.S.C. 101.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-20, and 22-67 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 2, 4, 10-13, 16-20, 22, 25-28, 31-39, 42-45, 48-53, 56-59, 62-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Danneels, U.S. Patent 6,038,598.

7. In considering claims 1, 19, 35, 50, and 64-67, Danneels teaches an apparatus and method comprising: determining by a computing device (i.e. 14) based at least in part on content of a valid locator of a first information page requested to be retrieved and displayed on a client system (12), whether to provide information browsing assistance (i.e. a web page set) for the first information page, said determining including analyzing a pattern of the locator of the first information page to determine whether the locator satisfies a pre-specified locator pattern, each pre-specified locator pattern identifying a plurality of additional locators of a plurality of additional locations having additional complementary or related information that amplifies information of the first information page, the analyzing including comparing the locator pattern against a

plurality of pre-specified locator patterns, (col. 2, lines 35-55, Fig. 1); and conditionally providing said information browsing assistance based at least in part on said determination, the information browsing assistance including all or a portion of the additional complementary or related information, (col. 2, lines 35-39).

8. In considering claims 2, 20, 36, and 51 Danneels teaches wherein said valid locator comprises a valid uniform resource locator (URL), (col. 2, lines 45-47).

9. In considering claims 4 and 22, Danneels teaches wherein said valid locator comprises a valid uniform resource locator (URL), (col. 2, lines 45-47); said pre-specified locator pattern is a pre-specified URL pattern, and said determining comprises analyzing whether said URL satisfies the pre-specified URL pattern, (col. 2, lines 45-47).

10. In considering claims 10 and 25, Danneels further teaches wherein said information browsing assistance comprises displaying a second information page (i.e. <http://server/d1/page2.html>), (col. 2, lines 56-65).

11. In considering claims 11, 26, 43, and 57, Danneels further teaches wherein said second information page effectively replaces said first information page, (col. 2, lines 56-65).

12. In considering claims 12, 27, 44, and 58, the teachings of Danneels teach wherein said second information page is additionally displayed complementing said first information page, (col. 1, lines 33-37).

13. In considering claims 13, 28, 45, and 59, Danneels teaches said second information page comprises the additional locators and/or the additional information, (col. 3, lines 15, 16).

14. In considering claims 16 and 31, Danneels teaches receiving by the computing device a request to retrieve and display said first information page, said request including said locator, (col. 2, lines 45-53).

15. In considering claims 17, 32, 48, and 62, the teachings of Danneels suggest in response to said receiving, notifying a monitor function of a browser helper of said receiving, (col. 2, lines 35-53); and said monitor function, in response to receipt of said notification, notifying an analyzer function of said browser helper, which performs said determining and conditional provision of information browsing assistance, (col. 2, lines 35-53).

16. In considering claims 18, 33, and 63, the teachings of Danneels suggest executing said monitor function as an extension of a browser (col. 2, lines 35-53), and executing said analyzer function external to the browser, (col. 2, lines 35-53).

17. In considering claim 34, Danneels suggests the apparatus being a selected one of a wireless telephone, a palm sized personal digital assistant, a notebook computer, a desktop computer, and a set top box, (col. 3, lines 43-62, Fig. 1).

18. In considering claim 37, Danneels teaches performing a selected one of (a) enabling the client system to determine whether the pre-specified locator pattern is met, and (b) enabling the client system to provide said locator to a server system (14) for the server system to determine for said client system whether the pre-specified locator pattern is met, (col. 2, lines 45-49).

19. In considering claim 38, Danneels teaches the server system being the same server system performing the receiving and the responsive providing, (col. 2, lines 45-49).

20. In considering claim 39, Danneels teaches wherein said valid locator comprises a valid URL and said pre-specified locator pattern is a pre-specified URL pattern, (col. 2, lines 45-49); and said executable instructions designed to perform a selected one of (a) to enable the client system to determine whether said URL satisfies the pre-specified URL pattern, and (b) enable the client system to provide said URL to a server system for the server system to determine for said client system whether the pre-specified locator pattern is met, (col. 2, lines 45-49).

21. In considering claim 42, Danneels further teaches either (a) said executable instructions are designed to enable the client system to provide said information browsing assistance by displaying a second information page, or (b) the method further comprising a server system providing said information browsing assistance to said client system by causing a second information page to be displayed on said client system, (col. 2, lines 45-49).

22. In considering claim 49, the teachings of Danneels further suggest wherein either (a) said browser helper further includes said analyzer function to perform said conditional provision of information browsing assistance, in response to receipt of said notification, or (b) the method further includes a server having said analyzer function to perform said conditional provision of information browsing assistance for said client system, in response to receipt of said notification from said client system, (col. 2, lines 35-53).

23. In considering claim 52, Danneels teaches wherein said first executable instructions designed to (a) enable the client system to determine whether the pre-specified locator pattern is met, or (b) request that the server system determine for said client system whether the pre-specified locator pattern is met, (col. 2, lines 45-49).



24. In considering claim 53, Danneels teaches wherein said valid locator comprises a valid URL (col. 2, lines 45-47), and said pre-specified locator pattern is a pre-specified URL pattern, (col. 2, lines 45-47).

25. In considering claim 56, Danneels further teaches wherein said first executable instructions designed to enable the client system to provide said information browsing assistance include instructions designed to enable the client system to display a second information page, (col. 2, lines 35-39).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

26. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

27. Claims 5, 6, 23, 24, 40, 41, 54, 55, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Danneels in view of Cohen et al. (hereinafter Cohen), U.S. patent 6,654,741.

28. In considering claims 5, 23, 40, and 54, Danneels further teaches wherein said pre-specified URL pattern comprises a URL pattern abstracting a plurality of valid

URLs of the plurality of locations having information that amplifies the information of the first information page, (col. 2, lines 45-47).

Although the teachings Danneels disclose substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: said analysis comprises matching said URL against a plurality of URL patterns.

Nevertheless, in analogous teachings, Cohen discloses an analysis comprising matching a URL against a plurality of URL patterns, (col. 6, .lines 9-28).

Thus, given the teachings of Cohen, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to modify the teachings of Danneels to expressly said analysis comprises matching said URL against a plurality of URL patterns. Doing so would have advantageously provided a flexible, convenient, and dynamic system and method for mapping a requested URL to an output URL to provide a requested resource, (Cohen, col. 1, line 66-col. 2, line 6, Danneels, col. 2, lines 45-49).

29. In considering claims 6, 24, 41, and 55, Cohen discloses each URL pattern comprising a plurality of portions correspondingly stored in a plurality of nodes of a tree data structure, with the plurality of nodes having a child leaf node specifying information browsing assistance to be provided, (col. 6, lines 9-28); and said matching comprises traversing said tree data structure, (col. 6, .lines 9-28). One of ordinary skill in the art would modify the teachings of Danneels with Cohen for reasons previously indicated in considering claims 5, 23, 40 and 54.

30. Claims 7, 8, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Danneels in view of Cohen, and further in view of Lyons et al. (hereinafter Lyons), U.S. Patent 6,094,665.

31. In considering claim 7, although the modified teachings Danneels disclose substantial features of the claimed invention, they further fail to expressly disclose: downloading said tree data structure from a server system onto said client system.

Nevertheless, in analogous teachings, Lyons discloses correcting URL patterns at a client system, (col. 4, line 59-col. 5, line 2).

Thus, given the teachings of Lyons, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to further modify the teachings of Danneels to expressly disclose downloading said tree data structure from a server system onto said client system. Doing so would have advantageously provided a flexible, convenient, and dynamic system and method for mapping an incorrect URL to a temporary web page that includes the possibly correct URL's, at the client system, (Cohen, col. 1, line 66-col. 2, line 6, Danneels, col. 5, lines 1-26, Lyons, col. 4, line 59-col. 5, line 2).

32. In considering claim 8, although the teachings Danneels disclose substantial features of the claimed invention, they further fail to expressly disclose: downloading said URL patterns and their corresponding information browsing assistance specifications from a server system onto said client system.

Nevertheless, in analogous teachings, Lyons discloses correcting URL patterns at a client system, (col. 4, line 59-col. 5, line 2).

Thus, given the teachings of Lyons, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to further modify the teachings of Danneels to expressly disclose downloading said URL patterns and their corresponding information browsing assistance specifications from a server system onto said client system. Doing so would have advantageously provided a flexible, convenient, and dynamic system and method for mapping an incorrect URL to a temporary web page that includes the possibly correct URL's, at the client system, (Danneels, col. 5, lines 1-26, Lyons, col. 4, line 59-col. 5, line 2).

33. Claims 14, 15, 29, 30, 46, 47, 60, 61, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Danneels in view of Risley et al. (hereinafter Risley), U.S. Patent 6,332,158.

34. In considering claims 14, 29, 46, and 60, although the teachings of Danneels disclose substantial features of the claimed invention, they fail to expressly disclose: wherein said information browsing assistance comprises modifying one or more environment attributes of the browsing environment within which said determining and conditional provision of information browsing assistance are performed.

Nevertheless, it was well known in the art at the time of the present invention to provide information browsing assistance comprising modifying one or more environment

attributes of a browsing environment within which determining and conditional provision of information browsing assistance are performed. This is evidenced in the teachings of Risley. More specifically, Risley teaches wherein information browsing assistance comprises modifying one or more environment attributes of a browsing environment within which determining and conditional provision of information browsing assistance are performed, (col. 12, lines 13-20).

Thus, given the teachings of Risley, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Danneels to expressly disclose wherein said information browsing assistance comprises modifying one or more environment attributes of the browsing environment within which said determining and conditional provision of information browsing assistance are performed. As was known in the art, this would have advantageously brought attention to important information provided in the page of the URL requested by the client system, (see Risley, col. 12, lines 13-20), such as an author of the requested content being "online", (see Danneels, col. 3, lines 18-26).

35. In considering claims 15, 30, 47, and 61, the teachings of Risley suggest wherein said one or more environment attributes comprising one or more of a display resolution attribute, a color resolution attribute, a font selection attribute, a media player preference attribute, an add-on selection attribute, and a plug-in selection attribute, (col. 12, lines 13-20). One of ordinary skill in the art would combine the teachings of

Danneels with Risley for reasons previously indicated in considering claims 14, 29, 46, and 60.

### ***Conclusion***

36. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

37. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to HASSAN PHILLIPS whose telephone number is (571)272-3940. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9a-5:30p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/HASSAN PHILLIPS/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2451